

Application No.: 10/510,291
Amendment Dated: January 9, 2008
Reply to Office Action of: September 12, 2007

MTS-3529US

Remarks/Arguments:

In light of the above amendments and remarks to follow, reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 10-12 have been amended and new claim 17 has been added. It is submitted that no new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 1, 3-12 and 14-17 are pending in this application.

The Examiner objected to claim 12 as being of improper dependent form as mentioned on page 2, paragraph 2 of the office action. By this amendment, claim 12 has been rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, it is submitted that the aforementioned objection has been rendered moot.

Claims 1 and 10-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) for the reasons mentioned in paragraph 5 on pages 3-6 of the office action. Without intending to acquiesce to the Examiner's rejection and in order to expedite allowance of this application, each of independent claims 1 and 10-12 has been amended as agreed upon with the Examiner at the personal interview.

Summary of the Interview

The Applicants would like to thank Supervisory Patent Examiner NgocYen Vu and Examiner James Meyers for conducting a personal interview with the Applicants' representatives on December 6, 2007 at the United States Patent & Trademark Office.

During the interview, Fig. 1 of the present application was used as an illustrative example by the Applicants' representatives to explain that a luminance generating means generates a luminance signal based on a comparison between the result of a color change detection and the result of a luminance change detection.

The Applicants' representatives explained that the Osada. reference (JP 2000-197067) fails to disclose or suggest such a feature. Particularly, Osada merely discloses using a luminance signal and color signals to generate Y, Cr and Cb signals. (See Fig. 1 and paragraphs 33 and 34 of Osada.) Osada does not disclose comparing the detected color change with the detected luminance change to generate a luminance signal.

Application No.: 10/510,291
Amendment Dated: January 9, 2008
Reply to Office Action of: September 12, 2007

MTS-3529US

As reflected on the interview summary form, agreement was reached with the Examiner that independent claims 1 and 10-12 as amended herein would be effective for distinguishing such claims over the prior art of record and overcoming the aforementioned rejection.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that each of independent claims 1, 10-12 and 17, as well as the claims dependent thereon, is clearly allowable and the Examiner is kindly requested to promptly pass this case to issuance.

In the event, however, that the Examiner has any comments or suggestion of a nature necessary to place this case in condition for allowance, then the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the Applicants' representatives to expedite allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

RatnerPrestia



Allan Ratner, Reg. No. 19,717
Attorney for Applicants

AR/nm/ms/fp

Dated: January 9, 2008

P.O. Box 980
Valley Forge, PA 19482-0980
(610) 407-0700

NM197968